

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Luong for the courtesy extended in the telephone interview of December 7, 2006. In the course of the interview, the prior art, Yamashita (US 5,946,978), was discussed. Applicant pointed out that Yamashita's cable guide portion 50 was not axially movable relative to adjusting member 40 as required by claim 15. Applicant further pointed out that FIGS. 2 and 3 of Yamashita show that the cable guide portion 50 of the base member 30 is fixed to a handlebar by the clamp 44. Examiner agreed to review Yamashita to determine whether the member 30 is fixed or not. In addition, Examiner asked Applicant to provide support in the specification for the phrase "deformably traversing along" in claim 15.

Claim 1 has been amended and new claim 25 has been added.

Claims 15-18, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamashita (US Patent No. 5, 946,978). Examiner states that Yamashita discloses an adjuster 50 rotatably connected to a housing 40 of the control mechanism 16 such that the adjuster 50 is axially movable relative to the housing 40 in response to rotation of the adjuster 50. Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner. In Yamashita, reference numeral 50 refers to a cable guide portion that is part of "a stationery or base member 30 which is fixed to the handlebar of the bicycle 10" by a clamp 44 (see specification at col. 3, lines 65-67 and col. 4, lines 10-12). Accordingly, the cable guide portion 50 is not axially moveable relative to the adjusting member 40 and is not rotatable as claimed in the claim 15. Further, since the cable guide portion 50 does not function as a rotatable adjuster as claimed in the present invention, the longitudinal extending slot 62 is not a detent contour extending along a radial interior surface of the adjuster as claimed in the present invention. Indeed, slot 62 merely retains segment 93 of the spring 42. For these reasons, this rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn.

Serial No. 10/605,852

Claims 16-18, 21 and 22 were rejected as claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Since claims 16-18, 21 and 22 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all the limitations of claim 15 as amended, they are felt to overcome the obviousness rejection in the same manner as amended claim 15.

The phrase "deformably traversing along" is supported in the specification. The spring element 26 includes a retention segment 27 and a support segment 38. The retention segment 27 engages the detent contour 5 and the support segment 38 is braced against a housing (see specification at paragraph [0027], lines 8-10). Since the support segment 38 is secured by the housing, the retention segment 27 deformably traverses along the detent contour 5 as the adjuster 28 is rotated.

This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the Examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTIN WEISS


Lisa Serdynski, Attorney
Registration No. 40,307
SRAM Corporation
1333 N. Kingsbury, 4th Floor
Chicago, IL 60622
(312) 664-3652